

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/648,445	08/27/2003	Heather N. Bean	10018579-1	4591	
22879 7590 65/21/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			KHAN, USMAN A		
	UAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION INS. CO 80527-2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2622		
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			05/21/2008	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM mkraft@hp.com ipa.mail@hp.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)				
10/648,445	BEAN ET AL.				
Examiner	Art Unit				
USMAN KHAN	2622				
	10/648,445 Examiner	10/648,445 BEAN ET AL. Examiner Art Unit			

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 05 May 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. \(\times \) The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: if box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The action on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action, or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any semed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on Abrief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(a)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filled, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).
AMENDMENTS 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s):
non-allowable claim(s), 7. \bigotimes for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) \square will not be entered, or b) \bigotimes will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-28</u> Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE
The affidavt or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 4.133(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER
11. \(\overline{\text{Z}}\) The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. ☐ Other:
Tive VIII
/Tuan V Ho/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2622

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The applicant argues that Lee fails to teach Wherein the first and the second set of pixels have different physical circuitry addressing and control lines going to them, respectively.

In response the examiner notes that Lee teaches that the figure 2 shift registers 23, 28 and anddress control 24, 26 also in figure 3 shift registers 33, 38 and enabling switch 34, 38, teaches different pysical circuity addressing and control lines gold to the pixels in either of the pixels regions 12 and 13 respectively as shown in figures 2 and 3. The applicant does not claim that different physical circuitry addressing and control lines of the different physical circuitry addressing and addressing and addressing and and control lines there are a first set of circuitry are dedicated only for the first set of pixels wherein from the different physical circuitry addressing and control lines there are a first set of circuitry are dedicated only for the first set of pixels and second set of circuitry are dedicated only for the second set of pixels. Hence Lee can broadly read on the pending another.

Also, applicant argues that Kinjo et al. and Horie et al. also do not teach the herein the first and the second set of pixels have different physical circuitry addressing and control lines going to them, respectively.

In response the examiner kindly requests the applicant see the examiner response above stating that Lee teaches this feature.

Also, applicant argues that Lee and Kinio et al are combinable.

In response to applicant's argument that Kinjo et al. is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, even though Kingle et al. does not teach only reading a section of the CCD less then all of the pixels, the examiner kindly notes that Kinjo et al. reference is being used for other treaching of the reference such as partitioning of the pixel sets to combine with Lee for the shortcomings of Lee. Hence the two references are combinable. Also, In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, are examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by os footing the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See In re Fine, 337 F.2d 1071, USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and In re Jones, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as discussed in the previous office action One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate the teachings of Kinjo et al. with the teachings of Lee et al. because in column 3, lines 31 - 50 Kinjo et al. teaches that the use of the invention provides a processing method which is caseble of producing a finished print with a natural feel from a corrected imade.

Also, applicant argues that the examiner uses impermissible hindsight to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See In re McLaughlin, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). In this case the motivation comes directly from the secondary references to inapprove the resulting image quality